DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 444 HE 010 274

TITLE A Follow-up Study of Recipients of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grants, 1977-78.
INSTITUTION Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Center for Higher Education.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 107p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *College Choice; Followup Studies; *Grants; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Private Colleges; Questionnaires; Research Projects; State Surveys; Student Characteristics; *Student Financial Aid; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program; *Virginia

ABSTRACT

The Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program (TAGLP) provides financial assistance to Virginia students attending independent colleges in Virginia. The study described in this report was designed to examine the group of students who receive financial assistance (in the form of grants) under the TAGLP, and to determine the impact of the Tuition Assistance Grants on the college decision-making of grant recipients. The report provides an overview of TAGLP, and describes the study methodology. The findings indicate that for approximately 41 percnt of the respondents, the availability of the Tuition Assistance Grants had some relationship to their decisicn to enroll at the private institution they were currently attending. The appendices contain 22 statistical tables and a copy of the questionnaire distributed to grant recipients. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157444

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF RECIPIENTS OF VIRGINIA TUITION ASSISTANCE GRANTS

1977 - 78

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Center for the Study of H.E. and Va

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

DECEMBER, 1977

HE010274

Study Team
School of Education
University of Virginia

Jay L. Chronister, Project Director
Associate Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Michael S. Caldwell
Director and Associate Professor
Bureau of Educational Research

Terry Schwartz
Assistant Professor
Bureau of Educational Research

Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr.
Director and Associate Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Leon P. Mallen, Jr.
Research Assistant on the Project
Graduate Student, School of Education

A Followup Study of Recipients of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grants 1977-78

Submitted to

The State Council of Higher Education

and The Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia

by

the School of Education

University of Virginia

December, 1977

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables.....

Chapter I - The Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program: An Overview..... 1

Legislative History of TAGLP.....4
Purpose of the Study.....6
Research Questions.....7

Chapter II - Study Methodology.....10

Instrument Development.....11
The Study Sample.....13
Instrument Administration.....16
Information Analysis.....17
Limitations.....19

Chapter III - Findings.....20

Characteristics of Study Sample.....20
Factors Relating to College Decision Making.....24
Analyses of Interrelationships Among Data.....33

Relationship of Income Levels to Institutional Tuition Levels.....33
Relationship of Selected Personal Characteristics to Income Levels.....34
Relationship of Income Levels to Factors Influencing College Decision Making.....39
Relationships of Selected Personal Characteristics to Institutional Tuition Levels.....47
Relationship of Tuition Levels to Factors Influencing College Decision Making.....51

Chapter IV - Summary and Conclusions.....62

The Research Questions and Summary Findings.....62

Appendices.....69

List of Tables

		Page
Table 2-1	Distribution of the Respondents among the Twenty-five Institutions of Higher Education	15
Table 2-2	Categorization of Institutions of Higher Education by Tuition (1977-78)	18
Table 3-1	Characteristics of Respondents	22
Table 3-2	Economic Status of Survey Respondents (N = 415)	23
Table 3-3	Description of "First Choice" Colleges of Respondents (N = 459)	26
Table 3-4	Factors Influencing Decision to Attend Current College	27
Table 3-5	Description of Activity that Respondents Would Have Pursued if They Had Not Received Grant (N = 164)	29
Table 3-6	Educational Cost(s) and Resource(s) Estimate	31
Table 3-7	Relationship of Family Income Levels to Tuition Levels	35
Table 3-8	Relationship of Respondents' Income Levels to Tuition Levels	36
Table 3-9	Relationship of Race with Family Income Levels	37
Table 3-10	Relationship of Race with Respondents' Income Level	38
Table 3-11	Relationship of Numbers of Brothers and Sisters with Family Income Levels	40
Table 3-12	Relationship of Numbers of Brothers and Sisters with Respondents' Income Levels	41
Table 3-13	Relationship of Academic Quality as Influential Factor to Family Income Levels	43

List of Tables (cont'd)

Page

Table 3-14 Relationship of Financial Assistance Amount as Influential Factor to Family Income Levels.....44

Table 3-15 Relationship of Specialized Academic Program as Influencing Factor to Family Income Levels.....45

Table 3-16 Relationship of Expectation of TAGLP Grant to Family Income Levels.....46

Table 3-17 Relationship of Aid Sufficiency Without TAGLP to Family Income levels.....48

Table 3-18 Relationship of Enrollment in College without TAGLP to Family Income Levels.....49

Table 3-19 Relationship of the Respondents' Descriptions of Proposed Activities to Family Income Levels.....50

Table 3-20 Relationship of Race to College Tuition Levels.....52

Table 3-21 Relationship of Number of Brothers and Sisters to College Tuition Levels.....53

Table 3-22 Relationship of Location as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels.....56

Table 3-23 Relationship of Academic Quality as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels.....57

Table 3-24 Relationship of Financial Assistance as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels.....58

Table 3-25 Relationship of Tuition Assistance as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels.....59

Table 3-26 Relationship of the Respondents' Enrollment in College without TAGLP to College Tuition Levels.....60

List of Tables (cont'd)

Page

Table 3-27 Relationship of the Respondents' Descriptions of Proposed Activity to College Tuition Levels.....61

Table A-1 Relationship of Choice as Influential Factor to Family Income Levels.....70

Table A-2 Relationship of Cost as an Influencing Factor to Family Income Levels.....71

Table A-3 Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from College to Respondents' Income Levels.....72

Table A-4 Relationship of Enrollment in College without TAGLP to Respondents' Income Levels.....73

Table A-5 Relationship of the Respondents' Descriptions of Proposed Activity without TAGLP to Respondents' Income Levels.....74

Table A-6 Relationship of Extra Money from Family to Family Income Levels.....75

Table A-7 Relationship of Extra Money from College to Family Income Levels.....76

Table A-8 Relationship of Location as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels.....77

Table A-9 Relationship of Academic Quality as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels.....78

Table A-10 Relationship of Cost as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels.....79

Table A-11 Relationship of Financial Assistance as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels.....80

Table A-12 Relationship of Academic Program as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels.....81

List of Tables (cont'd)

		Page
Table A-13	Relationship of Tuition Assistance as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels	82
Table A-14	Relationship of Aid Sufficiency without TAGLP to Respondents' Income Levels	83
Table A-15	Relationship of Extra Money from Family to Respondents' Income Levels	84
Table A-16	Relationship of Cost as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels	85
Table A-17	Relationship of Specialized Academic Programs as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels	86
Table A-18	Relationship of Aid Sufficiency to College Tuition Levels	87
Table A-19	Relationship of Aid Sufficiency without TAGLP to College Tuition Levels	88
Table A-20	Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from Family to College Tuition Levels	89
Table A-21	Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from College to College Tuition Levels	90
Table A-22	Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from Other Sources to College Tuition Levels	91

Chapter I

THE VIRGINIA TUITION ASSISTANCE GRANT AND LOAN PROGRAM: AN OVERVIEW

During the 1976-77 academic year, state aid in the form of grants and loans was provided to over eighty-five hundred students enrolled in private colleges in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program, through which financial assistance is provided Virginia students attending independent colleges, came into being to preserve the vitality of a pluralistic system of higher education and to encourage freedom of choice in college attendance.

Several factors converged in the 1960's and early 1970's to provide momentum for the enactment of legislation which created the Tuition Assistance and Loan Program in Virginia. The primary force giving rise to the legislation was the worsening financial situation of the independent colleges in the late 1960's which compromised their competitiveness in the higher education marketplace. As growing inflation and costs of services pushed tuition and fees upward in independent colleges, student enrollment began to reflect a relative decline vis à vis state institutions. At the very time when all colleges and universities in the state were experiencing a heavy growth in student enrollments,

those in the private sector began losing ground when compared to their sister state institutions. A comparison of enrollment statistics from 1964 and 1970 reveal the magnitude of the problem. In the fall of 1964, total enrollment in institutions of higher education in Virginia amounted to 71,421 students. Of these students, 32.5% (23,233) were enrolled in private institutions as compared to 67.5% (48,188) in state institutions. By the fall semester of 1970, total enrollment in all institutions had increased to 136,063. However, the percentage of private enrollment had declined to 26% (28,030 students) while the enrollment in state institutions had increased to 74% (108,033 students). Thus, during a six year period enrollments in private institutions had increased by 20.6% while in public institutions the growth amounted to 124.2%.[1] Clearly the vitality of a pluralistic system of higher education was in question.

A critical factor which contributed to the enrollment differential is the financial structure of the private colleges. They derive the bulk of their income from student tuition and fees, endowment income, and gifts and grants. In response to rising costs the private institutions must pass these costs on ~~to~~ the student consumer in the form of higher tuition and fees while the public institutions rely heavily upon state appropriations in order to meet

rising costs and thus are able to keep tuition relatively low. In the Virginia private colleges in 1960 the average tuition and fee charges amounted to $751. By the fiscal year 1970 this figure had increased to $1,585, or a 111% increase, while in comparable public institutions in the state the average tuition and fee charges amounted to $301.[2] As a result of this significant increase in tuition level and the comparatively low tuition in the public instututions, the private colleges had not only lost their competitive position in relation to the public sector but had also priced themselves beyond the economic market of many students they had traditionally attempted to serve.

The deteriorating financial condition of the private sector of higher education in Virginia in 1970 was highlighted by the fact that 18 of the 26 accredited institutions had operating deficits in their Educational and General budgets that year.[3]

Against this background, in 1970 the private colleges commissioned a study of the role and function of the private sector of higher education in the state. In February of the following year, the General Assembly also expressed its interest in independent institutions of Virginia and in its Senate Joint Resolution Number 21 called for a study of "...the role of the independent universities, colleges,

business colleges, and junior colleges in the State in the overall scheme of higher education, so that their services may be encouraged, strengthened and included in the future plans for development of higher education in the State."[4] This Resolution led to a study commissioned by the State Council of Higher Education. Thus, in a period of one year two studies of the problems and potential of the private sector were underway.

The findings of the two studies[5,6] were similar in terms of recommending aid to students as a way of assisting the private sector instituions. The specific programs recommended by the two study groups were different in that the state-commissioned study group recommended a need-based statewide scholarship program for undergraduates at either public or private institutions, while the private college group recommended tuition assistance in the form of forgiveable loans for students attending private colleges in the state. It was the recommendation of the private college group for student loans that provided the basis for the Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program (TAGLP) which is the subject of this study.

Legislative History of TAGLP[7]

The Tuition Assistance Loan Program bill, Senate Bill 77, was introduced and adopted in the 1972 legislative session.

It provided for tuition assistance loans for "bona fide residents of Virginia who attend private, accredited and nonprofit institutions of collegiate education in the Commonwealth whose primary purpose is to provide collegiate education and not to provide religious training or theological education."[8] The program was to provide loans which could be repaid in money or academic work. This program was challenged on constitutional issues and struck down by the Virginia Supreme Court in 1972.[9]

In the 1973 legislative session a revised Tuition Assistance Loan Program, Senate Bill 640,[10] was introduced which contained repayment provisions which the bill's patrons felt would pass court muster if challenged. The legislation was passed, but when subsequently challenged was only partially validated in terms of repayment options for students attending "sectarian" private institutions.[11]

With the implementation of the Tuition Assistance Loan Program in 1973 the same legislative session took action to initiate an amendment to the Virginia Constitution to permit grants to, or on behalf of, students attending these same institutions. The amendment was approved by public referendum in November 1974.[12] The Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program[13] was approved by the General Assembly during the 1975 session and the first Tuition Assistance Grants were

awarded to entering freshmen students effective with the Fall Semester 1976.

Since its inception as a loan program in 1973 and since the fall of 1976 when the grant program was implemented, the amount of the award (grant or loan) for an academic year has been $400. The number of awards has increased steadily since the beginning of the program in 1973-1974 and by the end of the 1976-77 academic year, for that single year, a total of 3,260 freshmen received grants and 5,294 upperclassmen received loans.[14]

Purpose of the Study

Since the implementation of this tuition assistance program no systematic assessment has been undertaken to determine whether the program is meeting its policy intent of increasing utilization of the independent colleges in the Commonwealth in meeting state higher education needs. The provision of a tuition assistance award was designed to assist in closing the tuition gap between public and private colleges and thereby enhancing student freedom of choice in college attendance decisions. The study described in this report was designed to gather information on the impact of the Tuition Assistance Grants on the college decision making of grant recipients.

Research Questions

The general research questions which were addressed include:

1. What are the characteristics of the Tuition Assistance Grant recipients on the following factors?
   a. Age
   b. Sex
   c. Race
   d. Marital Status
   e. Economic Status
   f. College Status
   g. Sources of Funding for College Attendance
2. How did the availability of this Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program affect the decision on college attendance?
   a. How many recipients would not have attended college without the Tuition Assistance Grant award?
   b. How many recipients would have attended another private institution if the Tuition Assistance Grant had not been available? Would the institution have been in-state or out-of-state?
   c. How many recipients would have attended a public institution if the Tuition Assistance award had not been available? Would the insti-

tution have been in-state or out-of-state?

d. How many recipients would have attended their current institution even without the Tuition Assistance Grant award?

1. Chronister, Jay L., McFarlane, W.H., and Taylor, A.L. Fact Book on Private Higher Education in Virginia. Charlottesville: Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia, October 1971, p 6.

2. Fact Book..., p. 20, and The Proposed Legislative Program of the Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia. Charlottesville: CICV, November 1971, p. 2.

3. Fact Book..., p. 14.

4. Senate Joint Resolution 21., February 1971.

5. Associated Consultants in Education, State Support for Private Higher Education in Virginia: A Report to the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia. Richmond, October 25, 1971.

6. McFarlane, W.H., and Chronister, J.L. Virginia's Private Colleges and the Public Interest: The Case for a Pluralistic System: A Report to the Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia. Durham, N.C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, October 1, 1971.

7. An indepth analysis of the history of the Tuition Assistance Loan Program through 1973 can be found in: McFarlane, W.H., Chronister, J.L., and Howard, A.E.D., "State Aid for Virginia's Private Colleges?", Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 2, No. 4, (October 1973) pp. 593-611.

8. Acts of the Assembly (1972), Title 23-38.12, Chapter 18 (1972).

9. Miller v. Ayres, 213 Va. 251, 191 S.E. 2d 261 (1972)

10. Acts of the Assembly (1973). Title 23-38.11, Chapter 2 (1973)

11. Miller v. Ayres, 214 Va. 171, 198 S.E. 2d 634 (1973)

12. Va. Const., Art. VIII, §11.

13. Acts of the Assembly (1975). Title 23-38.11, Chapter 400 (1975)

14. State Council of Higher Education

Chapter II

STUDY METHODOLOGY

As indicated earlier the general purposes of this study were (1) to describe the group of students who receive financial assistance (in the form of grants) under the Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program, and (2) to determine the impact of this financial assistance on the college decision making of the respondents. The general purposes of the study, the sources of information and the specific instrumentation were the result of a cooperative planning process involving the State Council of Higher Education, The Council of Independent Colleges, and the University of Virginia Study Team.

The three participating agencies mentioned above first agreed upon the general purposes and then agreed that the most appropriate source of the desired information would be the students themselves. As a result, a decision was made that a questionnaire survey would be the most appropriate method of collecting the required information.

The methodology portion of this report is structured to highlight the most important aspects of the study methodology and is organized according to the following sections:

(1) instrument development, (2) the study sample, (3) instrument administration and follow-up, and (4) information analysis.

Instrument Development

Because this study was designed and implemented to meet specific information needs of the State Council of Higher Education and the Council of Independent Colleges, appropriate input from these two agencies was considered critical to the development of the information collection instrumentation. As a result the University of Virginia Study Team adopted and implemented the following procedural steps in the development of the survey questionnaire.

a. Representatives of the Study Team met with representatives of the State Council of Higher Education and the Council of Private Colleges to determine the major areas of focus of the study. Agreements were reached that a description of the grant recipient group and the impact of grant assistance in influencing college attendance decisions would be appropriate areas of concern for this pilot study.

b. The Study Team met to discuss the problems of translating the general concerns of the study into specific areas of information and questions to be included in the study. The Study Team then drafted a preliminary version of the

survey instrument.

c. Representatives of the Study Team then met with representatives of the State Council of Higher Education and the Council of Independent Colleges to review the preliminary instruments. During these sessions the instrument was assessed relative to the utility of the information requested, the format of the instrument, the wording of the questions, gaps in the information to be collected, and areas of overlap of information.

d. The Study Team, based on the input secured in item c above, then revised the instrument. This revision consisted of some reorganization of the format of the instrument, the deletion of some questions, and the addition of questions.

e. The second draft of the instrument was then reviewed by representatives of the Study Team and the participating agencies and suggestions were made for further revisions.

f. Suggestions for revisions were incorporated into a third and final draft of the instrument. The final draft of the instrument was approved by representatives of the State Council of Higher Education and the Council of Independent Colleges. A copy of the final version of the instrument is included in Appendix B of this report.

The Study Sample

The development of the sample for the study was a complex task. First, there are twenty-five (25) private institutions in Virginia through which students are eligible to receive grant assistance under this program. Second, the study is concerned with only those students who received grants, and recipients of loans were to be excluded. Third, the timing of the study was such that the allocations of grants to students was still in process during the time at which the sample was to be selected. Fourth, student lists which were generated from the applications for assistance contained loan recipients as well as grant recipients, as well as students who had since decided not to attend the institutions to which they had applied for financial assistance.

Given the purposes of the study and the constraints listed above, several initial decisions regarding the study sample were made. First, the Study Team decided that a stratified random sample was most appropriate. In other words, the study sample would include individuals from all of the twenty-five private colleges and that individuals would be randomly selected from the pool of eligible individuals at each institution. Second, it was decided that a

ten per cent (10%) sample would be sufficient for the purposes of this study.

Specifically, the sample was developed as follows:

a. the total list of grant and loan applicants was supplied by the State Council of Higher Education;

b. an initial purge of non-relevant names, i.e., loan applicants and all third and fourth year students was conducted;

c. from the corrected list a random sample (by institution) was generated;

d. based on information from an institutional representative, each of the institutional samples was purged of non-relevant individuals;

e. replacements were added to the institutional lists to bring the institutional sample sizes up to a minimum of ten per cent (10%) of the eligible population of each institution.

Table 2-1 describes the distribution of the 463 sample respondents across the twenty-five private colleges in the study.

TABLE 2-1

Distribution of the Respondents among the Twenty-five Institutions of Higher Education

INSTITUTIONS	ABSOLUTE FREQ.	RELATIVE FREQ. (PCT)
Averett	27	5.8
Bluefield	9	1.9
Bridgewater	19	4.1
Eastern Mennonite	8	1.7
Emory & Henry	32	6.9
Ferrum	44	9.5
Hampden-Sydney	21	4.5
Hampton Institute	23	5.0
Hollins	10	2.2
Lynchburg	19	4.1
Liberty Baptist	9	1.9
Mary Baldwin	10	2.2
Marymount	6	1.3
Randolph Macon	32	6.9
Randolph Macon Womens	11	2.4
University of Richmond	57	12.3
Roanoke	29	6.3
St. Paul's	19	4.1
Shenandoah	5	1.1
Southern Seminary	7	1.5
Sweet Briar	5	1.1
Virginia Intermont	8	1.7
Virginia Union	18	3.9
Virginia Wesleyan	18	3.9
Washington & Lee	17	3.7
	463	100.0

Instrument Administration

Two approaches were used in administering the instruments. The decision of which approach would be used was based solely on institutional preference.

Approach A. This procedure was used with eleven (11) institutions of higher education and consisted of (1) sending the institutional sample list to the institutional representative, (2) the institutional representative then supplied an address for each student, (3) the Study Team mailed the questionnaire to the students in the sample, and (4) students returned, in a stamped addressed envelope which was supplied, the completed questionnaires to the Study Team at the University of Virginia.

Approach B. This procedure was used with fourteen (14) institutions of higher education and consisted of (1) sending the packaged instruments, with a student name on each, to the institutional representative, (2) the institutional representative then sent instruments to students via campus mail, and (3) students returned the completed questionnaires in a stamped addressed envelope, which was provided, to the Study Team at the University of Virginia.

Approximately two weeks after the first questionnaire was distributed, a follow-up was initiated. Students in the

sample were provided with a second copy of the questionnaire and were instructed to disregard the second instrument if they had already completed and returned the questionnaire.

Information Analysis

Information relative to the characteristics of grant recipients was analyzed and reported by frequency counts and percentages. In addition, cross tabulations were performed as the information was analyzed to determine if there are relationships (and, if so, the nature of such relationships) between selected respondent characteristics and respondents' college attendance. The statistic used for the cross tabulations is the Chi Square with the level of significance at .05. Measures of association appropriate to the Chi Square and the levels of measurement of the different variables also are used to indicate the direction of a relationship. Only in instances where the Chi Square statistic is significant is there an accompanying presentation of the direction of the relationship.

It should be noted that on those analyses which relate various respondent characteristics (i.e.:income level, race, etc.) to college tuition levels, the tuition levels are actual figures and not respondent perceptions of tuition levels. Table 2-2 depicts college tuition levels of the

TABLE 2-2

Categorization of Institutions of Higher Education by Tuition (1977-78)

CATEGORY	TUITION	INSTITUTIONS
1	$1,170	Liberty Baptist
	1,310	Bluefield
	1,550	Averett
	1,850	St. Paul's
	1,880	Virginia Union
2	$1,980	Emory & Henry
	2,020	Shenandoah
	2,085	Ferrum
	2,085	Virginia Intermont
	2,170	Hampton Institute
3	$2,400	Marymount
	2,500	Bridgewater
	2,596	Eastern Mennonite
	2,600	Lynchburg
	2,600	Virginia Wesleyan
	2,650	Southern Seminary
	2,675	Roanoke
4	$2,820	University of Richmond
	2,850	Hampden-Sydney
	2,940	Randolph Macon
5	$3,140	Washington & Lee
	3,350	Randolph Macon Women's
	3,500	Mary Baldwin
	3,850	Hollins
	3,905	Sweet Briar

(Source: State Council of Higher Education)

twenty-five private colleges in the study and the category levels to which each institution is assigned.

Limitations

The basic limitations of the study are as follows: (1) those concerns and problems relative to the development of the study sample, and (2) two different approaches used in the administration of the instruments as outlined under Instrument Administration.

Given the methodological concerns mentioned above, the study team would be reticent to generalize the findings of this study to the total number of students who applied for grants under the Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program for the 1977-78 academic year. However, the study team is confident of the descriptive information and interrelationships of characteristics for the four hundred and sixty-three (463) who responded to the study instrument.

Chapter III

FINDINGS

This study was conducted to gather information: (1) about the recipients of the Tuition Assistance Grant and, (2) on the impact that the Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program has on the college decision making of the respondents. In this chapter, the results of the data analyses are presented in three parts: (1) a description of the characteristics of the TAGLP grant recipients who responded to the questionnaire; (2) a presentation of information related to the college decision making of TAGLP grant recipients who responded to the questionnaire; and, (3) the analyses of the interrelationships among the various pieces of information collected.

Characteristics of Study Sample

Of the 463 respondents to the questionnaire, 51.2% are first-year students and 48.8% are second-year students. Because this study is concerned only with TAGLP grant recipients, no third and fourth-year students are included in the group of respondents. In addition, 48.4% of the respondents are male and 51.6% are female; 95.2% are not married and 4.8% of the respondents are married. The

average age of the respondents is 19 years with 90.7% of the respondents being between 17 and 20 years old (inclusive). The youngest person who responded is 17 years old, while the oldest is 39 years of age. All but one person responded to the question asking for information about race; 83.6% of the respondents are white and 16.4% are black.

In gathering information on family characteristics, the study team found that 93% of the respondents have one or more brothers or sisters. Of the respondents, 54.0% have either one or two siblings, 27.7% have three or four siblings, and 11.5% have five or more brothers and sisters. Additionally, 55% of those respondents who have siblings have at least one in secondary school, and 39% have at least one sibling in college. Seventy-two per cent of the respondents live in college housing, 21% live at home, 3% rent housing, and 4% have made "other" living arrangements. (See Table 3-1.)

The study team also gathered information on the economic status of the TAGLP grant recipients who responded to the questionnaire (see Table 3-2). Economic status was investigated in two ways: (1) by the economic independence or dependence of the respondent from his or her family, and (2) by the family or personal income level as reported by the respondent. Eighty-eight per cent (N=366) of the

TABLE 3-1

Characteristics of Respondents

CHARACTERISTIC	N	PER CENT OF TOTAL*
Year in College		
First	237	51.2
Second	226	48.8
Transferee		
Yes	36	7.8
No	427	92.2
Sex		
Male	224	48.4
Female	239	51.6
Marital Status		
Married	22	4.8
Unmarried	441	95.2
Age		
17-20	419	90.7
21-29	32	6.9
30-39	11	2.4
Race		
White	378	83.6
Black	74	16.4
Siblings		
0	31	6.7
1-2	249	54.0
3-4	128	27.7
5-8	53	11.5
Siblings in Secondary School		
1	155	65.7
2	60	25.4
3-5	21	8.9
Siblings in College		
1	121	72.0
2	38	22.6
3-5	9	5.4
Residence		
Parents' Home	95	20.6
College Housing	333	72.1
Rented Facility	15	3.2
Other	19	4.1

*Per Cent of total represents the per cent of the total number of respondents within each category.

TABLE 3-2

Economic Status of Survey Respondents (N = 415)

DEPENDENT ON FAMILY	N	PER CENT OF TOTAL (DEPENDENT)
Income Level of Parents		
Less than $5,000	24	6.6
$5,000 to $9,999	40	10.9
$10,000 to $14,999	73	20.0
$15,000 to $19,999	53	14.5
$20,000 to $24,999	53	14.5
$25,000 or more	123	33.6
Total	366	

INDEPENDENT FROM FAMILY	N	PER CENT OF TOTAL (INDEPENDENT)
Income Level of Respondents		
Less than $4,000	33	68.0
$4,000 to $5,999	6	12.0
$6,000 to $7,999	2	4.0
$8,000 to $9,999	2	4.0
$10,000 to $11,999	4	8.0
$12,000 or more	2	4.0
Total	49	

respondents to this question indicate they are economically dependent on their families; according to the students reporting, 34% of the families of those students have an income above $25,000 per year, 29% of the families have an income greater than $15,000 but less than $25,000, 20% of the families have an income that is greater than $10,000 per year but less than $15,000, and 17% of the families have incomes less than $10,000 per year. Of the 49 students (12% of those who answered this question) who declare that they are financially independent of their families, 68% report incomes of less than $4,000 per year, 12% report incomes between $4,000 and $5,999 per year, 8% report incomes between $6,000 and $9,999, 8% report incomes between $10,000 and $11,999, and 4% report incomes above $12,000 per year.

Thus, if one were to piece together the descriptive characteristics of the respondents to this survey into a composite, one could expect to see an unmarried, white female, about 19 years old who is a first-year student living in college housing, who has one or two brothers or sisters, and who is economically dependent on her family which has an income above $25,000 per year.

Factors Relating to College Decision Making

Of the 463 respondents to this survey, 36 or 7.8% are transfer students, 44% of whom transferred from a public

institution within the Commonwealth; 27% from another private institution within Virginia; and, 29% from an out-of-state institution. In addition, 364 or 79% of those persons responding acknowledge that the college they're attending was their "first choice." Of those who indicate that the college they're now attending was not their "first choice," 4.5% say that another private institution in Virginia had been their "first choice," 11.4% say that a public institution in the Commonwealth had been their "first choice," and 5.4% indicate that their "first choice" college had been one that was out-of-state. And, of those not attending their "first choice" college (95 students), 47% state the reason is that they were refused admission, 21% indicate non-attendance due to cost, and 32% indicate "other" reasons. (See Table 3-3.)

All respondents were requested to rank seven factors considered to exert an influence on their decision to attend the college in which they are currently enrolled (see Table 3-4). Of those students who chose to answer, 49% indicate that the college's location was either first or second in importance, 72% indicate the academic quality of the college as first or second in importance, 19% indicate the amount of financial assistance provided by the college as being either first or second, 34% indicate that a specialized academic program offering at their college was either

TABLE 3-3

Description of "First Choice" Colleges of Respondents (N = 459)

DESCRIPTION	N	PER CENT OF TOTAL
Currently attending "first choice" institution	364	78.6
"First choice" college was another private institution in Virginia	17	4.5
"First Choice" college was a public institution in Virginia	53	11.4
"First choice" college was a private, out-of-state institution	16	3.5
"First choice" college was a public, out-of-state institution	9	1.9

TABLE 3-4

Factors Influencing Decision to Attend Current College

FACTORS	RANKINGS (1 = HIGHEST PRIORITY)														TOTAL
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1. Location of College	89	20.3	125	28.5	108	24.7	56	12.8	21	4.8	30	6.8	9	2.1	438
2. Academic Quality of College	207	47.7	107	24.7	75	17.3	25	5.8	13	3.0	6	1.4	1	0.2	434
3. Cost to Attend College	10	2.4	38	9.1	44	10.6	98	23.5	83	19.9	102	24.5	42	10.1	417
4. Amount of Financial Assistance from College	38	9.1	40	9.6	54	13.0	55	13.2	103	24.8	83	20.0	43	10.3	416
5. Specialized Academic Program	50	12.0	90	21.5	88	21.1	71	17.0	59	14.1	44	10.5	16	3.8	418
6. Expectation of TAGLP	4	1.0	22	5.3	40	9.6	88	21.1	118	28.2	122	29.2	24	5.7	418
7. Other	41	8.9	16	4.0	19	4.7	20	5.0	13	3.2	18	4.5	275	68.4	402

of primary or secondary influence, and 12% indicate cost as influential. Only 26 students or 7% indicate the expectation of receiving a TAGLP grant as having been a primary or secondary influence in making a decision to attend their college.

For those persons who indicated that they are receiving financial assistance from the college in which they are currently enrolled (N=233), 137 or 59% feel that the aid package which they are receiving is sufficient to cover their educational expenses. However, only 10% of those persons receiving aid indicate that their aid package would be adequate without the TAGLP grant. Of the 90% (N=209) answering "no," 31% (or 64 students) would seek the extra money from their family to make up the difference; 5% (or 10 students) indicate the money might come from the college, and 18% (or 38 students) indicate the money would come from other sources. The remaining people indicate that they "don't know" where the needed money would come from.

In terms of college enrollment, 255 students or 59% of the respondents to this question indicate that they would have enrolled at their current college even if the TAGLP grant had not been available, 55 students or 13% said they would not have enrolled, and 119 students or 28% indicate that they might have enrolled at the college they're attending without

TABLE 3-5

Description of Activity that Respondents Would Have Pursued if They Had Not Received Grant (N = 164)

ACTIVITY	NUMBER RESPONDING	PER CENT OF RESPONDENTS
1. Attended current institution on part-time basis	10	6.1
2. Attended other Virginia private college	6	3.7
3. Attended out-of-state private college	5	3.0
4. Attended Virginia public college	90	54.9
5. Attended out-of-state public college	7	4.3
6. Not attended college this year	27	16.5
7. Other	19	11.6

the grant. Of the 164 students who indicate the activity they might have pursued had they not enrolled at their college full-time, 55% (or 90 students) indicate that they would have enrolled at a public college in the Commonwealth, 17% (or 27 students) said they would not have attended college this year, and 7% (or 12 students) indicate that they would have attended an out-of-state institution.

Thus, if one were to draw a composite of a respondent in terms of the factors which entered into his or her decision to attend the college in which enrolled, academic quality of the college would have been of greatest importance, followed by the college's location, specialized academic program, amount of financial assistance, and cost as primary influences. The representative individual might or might not be receiving financial assistance from the college other than the expected TAGLP grant, but would have enrolled in his or her college regardless of the TAGLP's grant availability.

In gathering information to serve as a base for policy-making and decision making, the study team asked respondents to estimate their educational costs for the 1977-78 academic year and their sources of funding to pay these costs. The results are portrayed in Table 3-6. The figures regarding estimated costs and resources must be viewed with caution

TABLE 3-6

Educational Cost(s) and Resource(s) Estimate

EDUCATIONAL COST(S) ESTIMATE	MEAN	N
Tuition & Fees	$2,710	407
Room & Board	1,190	237
Books & Supplies	175	403
Transportation	190	322
Other Expense(s)	360	296
Total	$3,960	424

RESOURCE(S) ESTIMATE	MEAN	N
Parents	$2,635	324
Spouse	2,147	14
Student Savings	630	199
Student Financial Assistance (all sources except TAGLP)	1,745	212
TAGLP	405	347
Other Resource(s)	1,115	63
Total	$3,925	391

since the numbers of students responding to each item varied significantly. In addition, the individual mean amounts under the cost(s) estimates and/or the resource(s) estimates are non-additive possibly due to: (1) the lack of uniformity in student reporting (financial aid recipients vs non-

recipients); (2) the mixture of commuting and resident students in the response group; and (3) the possible confusion in reporting figures for a specified period of time.

The accuracy of students' estimates of costs and resources is an important factor in understanding the students' assessments of the significance of the Tuition Assistance Grant to their planning. Two of the items shown in Table 3-3 are amenable to comparison with readily available data from other sources. The mean estimated tuition and fees amounts are shown in the table as $2,710. From the number of student respondents and actual tuition and fees charges of the institutions (see Table 2-2), a weighted mean tuition and fees figure of $2,461 was computed* which indicates the students, in the aggregate, estimated high on the tuition and fees costs. Conversely, the mean estimate on student financial assistance according to the 212 students responding to this item is $1,745. Recently, the financial aid officers of the 24 member institutions of the Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia provided information from which a mean financial aid package of $2,060 (excluding TAGLP) was computed. In this instance, we may assume the students estimated their financial assistance conservatively.

---

*Note: weighted mean tuition =

$$\frac{\text{actual institution tuition \& fees (1977-78)} \times \text{number responding students}}{\text{total number responding in total sample}}$$

Analyses of Interrelationships Among Data

In the previous two sections information was presented which relate to the direct purposes of the study: describing the characteristics of TAGLP grant-eligible students, and describing the student perceptions of the effect of TAGLP grant eligibility on college decision making. Further analyses of the data are presented in this section. This information interrelates selected characteristics of the respondents and selected factors influencing respondents' decision making to two factors: respondents' family income or personal income, and respondents' college attendance. For the purposes of these analyses, colleges were grouped by tuition level as explained in Chapter II, and income levels were grouped as follows: (1) dependent on family financing--family incomes greater than $20,000, incomes between $10,000 and $19,999, and incomes less than $9,999; and, (2) independent of family financing--respondent incomes greater than $10,000, incomes between $6,000 and $9,999, and incomes less than $5,999.

Relationship of Income Levels to Institutional Tuition Levels

Among those respondents who are dependent on their families for financing, the data show a difference in the college (by tuition level) at which they are in attendance

$\chi^2(8)=57.92$, $p \leq .0001$). In addition, further analyses indicate this difference is in a positive direction. This means that the higher a respondent's family income, the more likely one would find that person attending a college with a "higher" tuition level. Or, in other words, the lower a respondent's family income, the more likely that person is in attendance at a college with a "lower" tuition level.

This relationship does not hold for respondents who are independent from family financing, however. In this situation, the data show no relationship between respondents' income level and the tuition level of the college they are attending. (See Tables 3-7 and 3-8.)

Relationship of Selected Personal Characteristics to Income Levels

Race and Income Level. The data show a significant difference between white and black respondents in terms of their family incomes ($\chi^2(2)=70.67$, $p \leq .0001$), in a negative direction. This information indicates that one can associate (with some confidence) a higher family income with white respondents and a lower family income with black respondents.

This relationship of race with income levels does not hold for respondents who are independent of family financing. (See Tables 3-9 and 3-10.)

Numbers of Brothers and Sisters and Income Level. The data indicate a difference in the economic status of respond-

TABLE 3-7

Relationship of Family Income
Levels to Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		INCOME LEVELS (FAMILY)			
		$0000-$9,999	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000 and up	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	23	24	9	56
	Row Pct	41.1	42.9	16.1	15.3
	Col Pct	35.9	19.0	5.1	
	Tot Pct	6.3	6.6	2.5	
$1,980-$2,170		19	38	32	89
		21.3	42.7	36.0	24.3
		29.7	30.2	18.2	
		5.2	10.4	8.7	
$2,400-$2,675		14	20	49	83
		16.9	24.1	59.0	22.7
		21.9	15.9	27.8	
		3.8	5.5	13.4	
$2,820-$2,940		6	30	56	92
		6.5	32.6	60.9	25.1
		9.4	23.8	31.8	
		1.6	8.2	15.3	
$3,140-$3,905		2	14	30	46
		4.3	30.4	65.2	12.6
		3.1	11.1	17.0	
		.5	3.8	8.2	
	Column Total	64	126	176	366
		17.5	34.4	48.1	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 57.91892 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-8

Relationship of Respondents' Income Levels to Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		INCOME LEVELS (RESPONDENTS')			
		$0000-$5,999	$6,000-$9,999	$10,000 and up	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	15	3	3	21
	Row Pct	71.4	14.3	14.3	42.9
	Col Pct	38.5	75.0	50.0	
	Tot Pct	30.6	6.1	6.1	
$1,980-$2,170		5	1	2	8
		62.5	12.5	25.0	16.3
		12.8	25.0	33.3	
		10.2	2.0	4.1	
$2,400-$2,675		13	0	1	14
		92.9	0	7.1	28.6
		33.3	0	16.7	
		26.5	0	2.0	
$2,820-$2,940		4	0	0	4
		100.0	0	0	8.2
		10.3	0	0	
		8.2	0	0	
$3,140-$3,905		2	0	0	2
		100.0	0	0	4.1
		5.1	0	0	
		4.1	0	0	
	Column Total	39	4	6	49
		79.6	8.2	12.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 6.04087 with 8 degrees of freedom.

Significance = .6427

TABLE 3-9

Relationship of Race with
Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		RACE		
		White	Black	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	33	30	63
	Row Pct	52.4	47.6	17.6
	Col Pct	10.9	54.5	
	Tot Pct	9.2	8.4	
$10,000-$19,999		103	20	123
		83.7	16.3	34.5
		34.1	36.4	
		28.9	5.6	
$20,000 and up		166	5	171
		97.1	2.9	47.9
		55.0	9.1	
		46.5	1.4	
	Column Total	302	55	357
		84.6	15.4	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 70.67286 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-10

Relationship of Race with
Respondents' Income Level

INCOME LEVELS		RACE		
		White	Black	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	27	11	38
	Row Pct	71.1	28.9	79.2
	Col Pct	75.0	91.7	
	Tot Pct	56.3	22.9	
$6,000 $9,999		4	0	4
		100.0	0	8.3
		11.1	0	
		8.3	0	
$10,000 and up		5	1	6
		83.3	16.7	12.5
		13.9	8.3	
		10.4	2.1	
	Column Total	36	12	48
		75.0	25.0	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 1.87135 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .3923

ents' families depending on the number of brothers and sisters in the family ($\chi^2(6)=71.35$, $p \leq .0001$), in a negative direction. That is, one would be likely to find a lower family income level in a respondent's family with a higher number of brothers and sisters. (See Table 3-11.)

This association between number of siblings of a respondent and income levels does not hold for respondents who are independent of family financing. (See Table 3-12.)

Relationship of Income Levels to Factors Influencing College Decision Making

Priorities in Attending Current Institution and Income Levels. Given the first six factors influencing the respondent to attend the institution in which he/she is currently enrolled (Table 3-4), four of the factors show a difference depending on family income level: academic quality of the college, amount of financial assistance provided by the college, specialized academic program offered, and expectation of receiving a TAGLP grant. With the first factor, academic quality, as the importance of academic quality as a decision making factor increases, the family income level tends to increase. The same relationship is indicated between specialized academic program offerings and family income level.

The reverse relationship is true with the two other

TABLE 3-11

Relationship of Numbers of Brothers and Sisters with Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		NUMBER OF BROTHERS AND SISTERS				
		0	1-2	3-4	5-8	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	5	17	19	23	64
	Row Pct	7.8	26.6	29.7	35.9	17.5
	Col Pct	20.8	8.6	17.9	62.2	
	Tot Pct	1.4	4.7	5.2	6.3	
$10,000 $19,999		13	74	29	9	125
		10.4	59.2	23.2	7.2	34.2
		54.2	37.4	27.4	24.3	
		3.6	20.3	7.9	2.5	
$20,000 and up		6	107	58	5	176
		3.4	60.8	33.0	2.8	48.2
		25.0	54.0	54.7	13.5	
		1.6	29.3	15.9	1.4	
	Column Total	24	198	106	37	365
		6.6	54.2	29.0	10.1	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 71.35101 with 6 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-12

Relationship of Numbers of Brothers and Sisters with Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		NUMBER OF BROTHERS AND SISTERS				
		0	1-2	3-4	5-8	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	3	13	13	10	39
	Row Pct	7.7	33.3	33.3	25.6	81.3
	Col Pct	100.0	61.9	92.9	100.0	
	Tot Pct	6.3	27.1	27.1	20.8	
$6,000 $9,999		0	2	1	0	3
		0	66.7	33.3	0	6.3
		0	9.5	7.1	0	
		0	4.2	2.1	0	
$10,000 and up		0	6	0	0	6
		0	100.0	0	0	12.5
		0	28.6	0	0	
		0	12.5	0	0	
	Column Total	3	21	14	10	48
		6.3	43.8	29.2	20.8	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 10.66667 with 6 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0992

factors, financial assistance and TAGLP grant expectation, as one might expect. That is, as the level of family income increases, amount of financial assistance and TAGLP grant expectation decrease in terms of their priority as factors influencing college decision making. One would have expected that information, or its converse: the lower the family income, the more likely that the amount of financial assistance provided and the expectation of receiving a TAGLP grant would be of high priority in a respondent's college decision making. (See Tables 3-13 to 3-16.)

None of these relationships or differences hold upon examination of data from respondents who are financially independent from their families.

Financial Factors and Income Levels. Three financial factors are considered in investigating relationships: aid sufficiency without the TAGLP grant, enrollment at college currently attending, and description of activity respondent would have pursued had the TAGLP grant not been available. For all three factors, there is no relationship with income levels for those respondents who indicated independence from family financing.

Relationships are found, however, with the three factors and income levels among respondents who are financially dependent on their families. Although the aid sufficiency

TABLE 3-13

Relationship of Academic Quality as Influential Factor to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF ACADEMIC QUALITY AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	38	16	7	61
	Row Pct	62.3	26.2	11.5	17.6
	Col Pct	14.5	22.5	50.0	
	Tot Pct	11.0	4.6	2.0	
$10,000-$19,999		83	32	4	119
		69.7	26.9	3.4	34.3
		31.7	45.1	28.6	
		23.9	9.2	1.2	
$20,000 and up		141	23	3	167
		84.4	13.8	1.8	48.1
		53.8	32.4	21.4	
		40.6	6.6	.9	
	Column Total	262	71	14	347
		75.5	20.5	4.0	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 21.32034 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0003

TABLE 3-14

Relationship of Financial Assistance Amount as Influential Factor to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	20	19	22	61
	Row Pct	32.8	31.1	36.1	18.4
	Col Pct	31.3	21.8	12.2	
	Tot Pct	6.0	5.7	6.6	
$10,000-$19,999		35	36	42	113
		31.0	31.9	37.2	34.0
		54.7	41.4	23.2	
		10.5	10.8	12.7	
$20,000 and up		9	32	117	158
		5.7	20.3	74.1	47.6
		14.1	36.8	64.6	
		2.7	9.6	35.2	
	Column Total	64	87	181	332
		19.3	26.2	54.5	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 54.10072 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-15

Relationship of Specialized Academic Program as Influencing Factor to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFERING AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	12	23	26	61
	Row Pct	19.7	37.7	42.6	18.2
	Col Pct	11.1	17.4	27.1	
	Tot Pct	3.6	6.8	7.7	
$10,000-$19,999		40	35	38	113
		35.4	31.0	33.6	33.6
		37.0	26.5	39.6	
		11.9	10.4	11.3	
$20,000 and up		56	74	32	162
		34.6	45.7	19.8	48.2
		51.9	56.1	33.3	
		16.7	22.0	9.5	
	Column Total	108	132	96	336
		32.1	39.3	28.6	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 16.96806 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0020

TABLE 3-16

Relationship of Expectation of TAGLP
Grant to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF TAGLP AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	8	23	30	61
	Row Pct	13.1	37.7	49.2	18.3
	Col Pct	38.1	24.0	13.9	
	Tot Pct	2.4	6.9	9.0	
$10,000-$19,999		9	30	75	114
		7.9	26.3	65.8	34.2
		42.9	31.3	34.7	
		2.7	9.0	22.5	
$20,000 and up		4	43	111	158
		2.5	27.2	70.3	47.4
		19.0	44.8	51.4	
		1.2	12.9	33.3	
	Column Total	21	96	216	333
		6.3	28.8	64.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 13.60489 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0087

without TAGLP factor is not significant "technically" ($\chi^2(2)=5.24$, $p \leq .08$), the study team sees the relationship as being meaningfully different. This meaningful difference indicates that people whose families have a lower level of income would not be receiving sufficient aid without the TAGLP grant. Interestingly, of the people who indicated insufficient aid without TAGLP, there was a significant difference in the relationship of their family income with their expectation that the money could come from their family. That is, respondents whose family income is in a "higher" bracket would expect the extra money to come from their families, while respondents whose family income is lower did not indicate that they could receive the needed money from their families. In addition, respondents whose family income was in a "lower" category indicated that they might not have enrolled in their current college without the TAGLP grant ($\chi^2(4)=38.13$, $p \leq .0001$). (See Tables 3-17 to 3-19.)

Finally, in looking at respondents' income levels and their description of what they might have done had TAGLP not been available, no significant differences were found.

Relationships of Selected Personal Characteristics to Institutional Tuition Levels

Race and Tuition Level. The data show a significant

TABLE 3-17

Relationship of Aid Sufficiency Without TAGLP to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		AID SUFFICIENCY WITHOUT TAGLP		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	3	50	53
	Row Pct	5.7	94.3	30.5
	Col Pct	15.8	32.3	
	Tot Pct	1.7	28.7	
$10,000-$19,999		7	68	75
		9.3	90.7	43.1
		36.8	43.9	
		4.0	39.1	
$20,000 and up		9	37	46
		19.6	80.4	26.4
		47.4	23.9	
		5.2	21.3	
	Column Total	19	155	174
		10.9	89.1	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 5.23586 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0730

TABLE 3-18

Relationship of Enrollment in College without TAGLP to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		COLLEGE ENROLLMENT WITHOUT TAGLP			
		Yes	No	Maybe	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	23	14	25	62
	Row Pct	37.1	22.6	40.3	18.1
	Col Pct	11.0	35.0	26.9	
	Tot Pct	6.7	4.1	7.3	
$10,000 - $19,999		61	18	38	117
		52.1	15.4	32.5	34.1
		29.0	45.0	40.9	
		17.8	5.2	11.1	
$20,000 and up		126	8	30	164
		76.8	4.9	18.3	47.8
		60.0	20.0	32.3	
		36.7	2.3	8.7	
	Column Total	210	40	93	343
		61.2	11.7	27.1	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 38.13490 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-19

Relationship of the Respondents' Descriptions of Proposed Activities to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		RESPONDENTS' DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPOSED ACTIVITIES					
		Attend Va. Private College	Attend Out-of State College	Attend Public Va. College	Not Attend College	Other	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	6	1	18	8	4	37
	Row Pct	16.2	2.7	48.6	21.6	10.8	29.6
	Col Pct	54.5	14.3	23.4	47.1	30.8	
	Tot Pct	4.8	.8	14.4	6.4	3.2	
$10,000-$19,999		4	1	35	7	6	53
		7.5	1.9	66.0	13.2	11.3	42.4
		36.4	14.3	45.5	41.2	46.2	
		3.2	.8	28.0	5.6	4.8	
$20,000 and up		1	5	24	2	3	35
		2.9	14.3	68.6	5.7	8.6	28.0
		9.1	71.4	31.2	11.8	23.1	
		.8	4.0	19.2	1.6	2.4	
	Column Total	11	7	77	17	13	125
		8.8	5.6	61.6	13.6	10.4	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 15.35814 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0525

difference between white and black respondents and the college which they are attending ($\chi^2(4)=114.08$, $p < .0001$), in a negative direction. This information indicates that one can most probably find white respondents attending colleges with "higher" tuition levels, and black respondents attending colleges with a "lower" tuition level. (See Table 3-20.)

Numbers of Brothers and Sisters and Tuition Level. The data indicate a difference in the college in which the respondents are enrolled (by tuition level) and the number of siblings in the respondents' families ($\chi^2(12)=30.60$, $p < .003$). Although one can draw conclusions about the direction of the difference only tentatively, it does seem as if the more siblings in a respondent's family, the more likely he/she is to be enrolled at a college with a "lower" tuition level. (See Table 3-21.)

Relationship of Tuition Levels to Factors Influencing College Decision Making

Priorities in Attending Current Institution and Income Levels. Of the first six factors influencing the respondent to attend the institution in which he/she is currently enrolled, four of the factors show a difference depending on the tuition level of the college: location of the college, academic quality of the college, amount of financial assistance provided by the college, and expecta-

TABLE 3-20

Relationship of Race to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		RACE		
		White	Black	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	41	41	82
	Row Pct	50.0	50.0	18.1
	Col Pct	10.8	55.4	
	Tot Pct	9.1	9.1	
$1,980-$2,170		83	28	111
		74.8	25.2	24.6
		22.0	37.8	
		18.4	6.2	
$2,400-$2,675		95	4	99
		96.0	4.0	21.9
		25.1	5.4	
		21.0	.9	
$2,820-$2,940		107	1	108
		99.1	.9	23.9
		28.3	1.4	
		23.7	.2	
$3,140-$3,905		52	0	52
		100.0	0	11.5
		13.8	0	
		11.5	0	
	Column Total	378	74	452
		83.6	16.4	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 114.07846 with 4 degrees of freedom
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-21

Relationship of Number of Brothers and Sisters to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		NUMBER OF BROTHERS AND SISTERS				
		0	1,2	3,4	5-8	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	7	36	19	20	82
	Row Pct	8.5	43.9	23.2	24.4	17.8
	Col Pct	22.6	14.5	14.8	37.7	
	Tot Pct	1.5	7.8	4.1	4.3	
$1,980-$2,170		7	56	33	14	110
		6.4	50.9	30.0	12.7	23.9
		22.6	22.5	25.8	26.4	
		1.5	12.1	7.2	3.0	
$2,400-$2,675		12	55	29	10	106
		11.3	51.9	27.4	9.4	23.0
		38.7	22.1	22.7	18.9	
		2.6	11.9	6.3	2.2	
$2,820-$2,940		3	66	34	7	110
		2.7	60.0	30.9	6.4	23.9
		9.7	26.5	26.6	13.2	
		.7	14.3	7.4	1.5	
$3,140-$3,905		2	36	13	2	53
		3.8	67.9	24.5	3.8	11.5
		6.5	14.5	10.2	3.8	
		.4	7.8	2.8	.4	
	Column Total	31	249	128	53	461
		6.7	54.0	27.8	11.5	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 30.60188 with 12 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0023

tion of a TAGLP grant. (Note: the last three factors listed here are also of major importance in their relationship to family income level, as discussed above.) With the first factor, location of the college, the data indicate a significant difference of the priority this factor has depending on the tuition level of the college in which enrolled ($\chi^2(8)=20.10$, $p < .01$), although the direction of the difference is not clear. It would appear, though, that the greater the priority of college location in a respondent's decision making, the more likely is the situation that the person would be enrolled at a college with a higher tuition level. The same relationship exists between a college's tuition level and the importance of the academic quality of the college as a decision making factor ($\chi^2(8)=44.89$, $p < .0001$). However, the strength of the directional relationship is greater: the higher the tuition of the college, the greater the possibility that academic quality is a prime influencing factor.

The reverse relationship is true with the other two factors, financial assistance and TAGLP grant expectation, as one might expect. That is, as the level of tuition increases, amount of financial assistance and TAGLP grant expectation decrease in terms of their priority as factors influencing college decision making. One would not have

expected that information, or its converse: the lower the college tuition level, the more likely that the amount of financial assistance provided and the expectation of receiving a TAGLP grant would be of high priority in a respondent's decision making, except for one fact. That fact relates to the information discussed above indicating that family incomes are higher among respondents enrolled in colleges with higher tuition levels. (See Tables 3-22 to 3-25.)

Financial Factors and Income Levels. Three financial factors are considered in investigating relationships: aid sufficiency without the TAGLP grant, enrollment at college currently attending, and description of activity respondent would have pursued had the TAGLP grant not been available. There was no relationship found between aid sufficiency without the TAGLP grant and the tuition levels of the colleges.

Relationships are found, however, with the enrollment factor ($\chi^2(8)=39.87$, $p < .0001$) and the activity factor ($\chi^2(16)=36.08$, $p < .003$). These differences and other analyses indicate that as the tuition level of the colleges increased, the greater the likelihood that the respondent: (1) would have enrolled even without the TAGLP assistance, and (2) would have attended a Virginia public institution or another in-state private college or attended their current college on a part-time basis. (See Tables 3-26 and 3-27.)

TABLE 3-22

Relationship of Location as an Influence
on Choice to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		PRIORITY OF LOCATION AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	42	17	13	72
	Row Pct	58.3	23.6	18.1	16.4
	Col Pct	19.6	10.4	21.7	
	Tot Pct	9.6	3.9	3.0	
$1,980-$2,170		44	42	22	108
		40.7	38.9	20.4	24.7
		20.6	25.6	36.7	
		10.0	9.6	5.0	
$2,400-$2,675		57	34	11	102
		55.9	33.3	10.8	23.3
		26.6	20.7	18.3	
		13.0	7.8	2.5	
$2,820-$2,940		51	45	10	106
		48.1	42.5	9.4	24.2
		23.8	27.4	16.7	
		11.6	10.3	2.3	
$3,140-$3,905		20	26	4	50
		40.0	52.0	8.0	11.4
		9.3	15.9	6.7	
		4.6	5.9	.9	
	Column Total	214	164	60	438
		48.9	37.4	13.7	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 20.09638 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0100

TABLE 3-23

Relationship of Academic Quality as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		PRIORITY OF ACADEMIC QUALITY AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	32	29	8	69
	Row Pct	46.4	42.0	11.6	15.9
	Col Pct	10.2	29.0	40.0	
	Tot Pct	7.4	6.7	1.8	
$1,980-$2,170		75	27	6	108
		69.4	25.0	5.6	24.9
		23.9	27.0	30.0	
		17.3	6.2	1.4	
$2,400-$2,675		70	27	4	101
		69.3	26.7	4.0	23.3
		22.3	27.0	20.0	
		16.1	6.2	.9	
$2,820-$2,940		93	11	1	105
		88.6	10.5	1.0	24.2
		29.6	11.0	5.0	
		21.4	2.5	.2	
$3,140-$3,905		44	6	1	51
		86.3	11.8	2.0	11.8
		14.0	6.0	5.0	
		10.1	1.4	.2	
	Column	314	100	20	434
	Total	72.4	23.0	4.6	100.0

Raw Chi Square =44.88808 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-24

Relationship of Financial Assistance as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		PRIORITY OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	18	16	36	70
	Row Pct	25.7	22.9	51.4	16.8
	Col Pct	23.1	14.7	15.7	
	Tot Pct	4.3	3.8	8.7	
$1,980-$2,170		20	36	47	103
		19.4	35.0	45.6	24.8
		25.6	33.0	20.5	
		4.8	8.7	11.3	
$2,400-$2,675		11	31	56	98
		11.2	31.6	57.1	23.6
		14.1	28.4	24.5	
		2.6	7.5	13.5	
$2,820-$2,940		16	18	64	98
		16.3	18.4	65.3	23.6
		20.5	16.5	27.9	
		3.8	4.3	15.4	
$3,140-$3,905		13	8	26	47
		27.7	17.0	55.3	11.3
		16.7	7.3	11.4	
		3.1	1.9	6.3	
	Column Total	78	109	229	416
		18.8	26.2	55.0	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 19.08888 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0144

TABLE 3-25

Relationship of Tuition Assistance as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		PRIORITY OF TAGLP AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	8	23	37	68
	Row Pct	11.8	33.8	54.4	16.3
	Col Pct	30.8	18.0	14.0	
	Tot Pct	1.9	5.5	8.9	
$1,980-$2,170		9	35	57	101
		8.9	34.7	56.4	24.2
		34.6	27.3	21.6	
		2.2	8.4	13.6	
$2,400-$2,675		7	26	66	99
		7.1	26.3	66.7	23.7
		26.9	20.3	25.0	
		1.7	6.2	15.8	
$2,820-$2,940		1	35	66	102
		1.0	34.3	64.7	24.4
		3.8	27.3	25.0	
		.2	8.4	15.8	
$3,140-$3,905		1	9	38	48
		2.1	18.8	79.2	11.5
		3.8	7.0	14.4	
		.2	2.2	9.1	
Column Total		26	128	264	418
		6.2	30.6	63.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 18.24140 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0195

TABLE 3-26

Relationship of the Respondents' Enrollment in College without TAGLP to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		ENROLLMENT IN COLLEGE WITHOUT TAGLP			
		Yes	No	Maybe	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	36	16	26	78
	Row Pct	46.2	20.5	33.3	18.2
	Col Pct	14.1	29.1	21.8	
	Tot Pct	8.4	3.7	6.1	
$1,980-$2,170		47	11	42	100
		47.0	11.0	42.0	23.3
		18.4	20.0	35.3	
		11.0	2.6	9.8	
$2,400-$2,675		57	19	24	100
		57.0	19.0	24.0	23.3
		22.4	34.5	20.2	
		13.3	4.4	5.6	
$2,820-$2,940		75	5	21	101
		74.3	5.0	20.8	23.5
		29.4	9.1	17.6	
		17.5	1.2	4.9	
$3,140-$3,905		40	4	6	50
		80.0	8.0	12.0	11.7
		15.7	7.3	5.0	
		9.3	.9	1.4	
	Column Total	255	55	119	429
		59.4	12.8	27.7	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 39.86729 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0000

TABLE 3-27

Relationship of the Respondents' Descriptions of Proposed Activity to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		ACTIVITY					
		Attend Private Va. College	Attend Out-of State College	Attend Public Va. College	Not Attend College	Other	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	7	5	15	10	3	40
	Row Pct	17.5	12.5	37.5	25.0	7.5	24.4
	Col Pct	43.8	41.7	16.7	37.0	15.8	
	Tot Pct	4.3	3.0	9.1	6.1	1.8	
$1,980-$2,170		2	1	26	9	12	50
		4.0	2.0	52.0	18.0	24.0	30.5
		12.5	8.3	28.9	33.3	63.2	
		1.2	.6	15.9	5.5	7.3	
$2,400-$2,675		2	4	25	7	3	41
		4.9	9.8	61.0	17.1	7.3	25.0
		12.5	33.3	27.8	25.9	15.8	
		1.2	2.4	15.2	4.3	1.8	
$2,820-$2,940		5	2	14	1	1	23
		21.7	8.7	60.9	4.3	4.3	14.0
		31.3	16.7	15.6	3.7	5.3	
		3.0	1.2	8.5	.6	.6	
$3,140-$3,905		0	0	10	0	0	10
		0	0	100.0	0	0	6.1
		0	0	11.1	0	0	
		0	0	6.1	0	0	
Column Total		16	12	90	27	19	164
		9.8	7.3	54.9	16.5	11.6	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 36.07726 with 16 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0028

Chapter IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the basic findings of the study are summarized and conclusions which can be drawn from the findings are set forth. The results presented are based upon the responses of 463 students who were awarded tuition grants for the 1977-78 academic year.

The Research Questions and Summary Findings

1. What are the characteristics of the Tuition Assistance Grant recipients on the following factors?

a. Age: The average age of the respondents is 19 years with nearly 91% of the respondents being between 17 and 20 years old. The range is from 17 to 39 years of age.

b. Sex: Among the respondents 51.6% are female and 48.4% are male.

c. Race: All but one person responded to the question asking for information about race; 83.6% of the respondents are white and 16.4% are black.

d. Marital Status: Most of the students who participated in this study are single (95.2%); only 4.8% of the respondents are married.

e. Economic Status: Eighty-eight per cent (N = 366) of the respondents indicate that they are economically dependent on their families. Of these students, 34% report a family income above $25,000 per year; 29% report an income greater than $15,000 but less than $25,000; 20% report family income greater than $10,000 but less than $15,000 per year; 17% indicate a family income level less than $10,000 per year.

Of the 12% (N = 49) of the respondents who declare that they are financially independent of their families, 68% report incomes of less than $4,000 per year, 12% report incomes between $4,000 and $5,999 per year, 8% report incomes between $6,000 and $9,999 per year, 8% report incomes between $10,000 and $11,999, and 4% report incomes above $12,000 per year.

f. College Status: First-year students comprise 51.2% of the respondents to the questionnaire; 48.8% of the respondents are second-year students. (Because this study is concerned only with TAGLP grant recipients, no third and fourth-year students are included in the group of respondents.)

Seventy-nine per cent (364) of the students responding claim that the college they are attending was their "first choice." Of the 21% who state that the college they are now attending was not their "first choice," 18% indicate

that another private institution in Virginia had been their "first choice," 56% stated a preference for a public institution in Virginia as their "first choice," and 26% indicate that their "first choice" college was an out-of-state institution. Of the 95 students (21%) who are not attending their "first choice" institutions, 47% state that they were refused admission to their preferred college, 21% cite financial considerations to explain non-attendance, and 32% indicate "other" reasons.

When asked to rank seven factors which exerted an influence on their decision to attend the college in which they are currently enrolled, (1) 72%* (314) cite academic quality of the college as first or second in importance; (2) 49% of the students (214) who responded to the question indicate that the college's location was either first or second in importance; (3) 34% indicate that the availability of a specialized academic program offering at their college was either a primary or secondary influence; (4) 19% note the amount of financial assistance provided by the college as a first or second level priority consideration; and (5) 12% point to cost as influential. Only 26 students, or 7%, indicate the expectation of receiving a TAGLP grant as hav-

---

*Note: These percentages represent the aggregation of data from the first and second columns of Table 3-4, and therefore the total exceeds 100%.

ing been a primary or secondary influence affecting their decision. For the majority of students included in this study then, financial considerations are not "top priority" concerns when selecting a college to attend. However, for some students the size of the aid package and cost are important considerations.

g. Sources of Funding for College Attendance: In estimating sources of funding for college expenses, students participating in this study reveal heavy reliance upon parental assistance ($2,635 average estimate, N = 324) or, in the case of married students, assistance from their spouse ($2,147 average estimate, N = 14). One hundred and ninety-nine students estimate they are applying an average of $630 toward their college expenses from personal savings. Student financial assistance from all sources except TAGLP is estimated by 212 students to equal $1,745. In addition to the TAGLP grant 63 students note an average of $1,115 available through "other resources." (Since the number of students responding to each of these items varied significantly and at best represent "estimates," these data must be viewed with caution.)

2. How did the availability of TAGLP affect the decision on college attendance?

In attempting to assess the influence of the TAGLP

grant on the decisions on college attendance, the respondents were requested to indicate what they would have done if the grant had not been available.

In response to this area of inquiry 59% (255) of the respondents to the question indicated that they would have enrolled at their current college full-time even if the TAGLP grant had not been available. Of the remaining students, 13% stated they would not have enrolled and 28% indicated that they might not have enrolled. Of the 164 students who indicated the activity they might have pursued had they not enrolled at their current institution on a full-time basis, 27 stated they would not have attended college this year.

When student responses to this question were analyzed by family income level significant differences were found with students from lower income families being more inclined not to attend the current college without the grant.

In analyzing student responses to this item by tuition level of the institution they attend, significant differences were also found. Students attending institutions with lower tuition were more likely to indicate they would not, or were unsure if they would, attend their current college without the Tuition Grant award. This finding is in keeping with the study findings that the higher the family income level the greater the possibility that the student would attend the

higher tuition institutions and the lower the income the greater the significance of student aid.

Of the 164 students who indicated what they would have done if they were not sure of attending, or definitely would not attend the college at which currently enrolled without the TAGLP grant, only 6 (3.7%) students indicated they would have attended another in-state private institution and 5 (3%) would have attended an out-of-state private college.

Once again, of the 164 respondents to the question, 55% (90) stated they would have enrolled at a public institution in the Commonwealth if the Tuition Grant had not been available. An additional 4.3% (7 students) indicated they would have attended an out-of-state public institution. When the decision to attend a public college in the Commonwealth is related to family income within each classification, as the income level increases the proportion of respondents who indicate attendance at a public institution as an alternative to not attending the current institution on a full-time basis increases. Similarly, as the tuition level of institutions the respondents attend increases, a larger proportion of the students cite attendance at a public college in Virginia as the alternative if the Tuition Grant were not available.

In view of the findings reported in the study, it appears that for approximately 41% of the respondents, the availability of the Tuition Assistance Grant had some relationship to their decision to enroll at the private institution they are currently attending. Conversely, 59% indicate the grant had no impact on their decisions.

When students were requested to rank seven factors such as academic quality, location of the college, specialized programs, total financial aid package, etc., which are considered to be influential in affecting college decision-making, it is not surprising that only 26 students cited the expectation of receiving the Tuition Assistance Grant as of primary importance in their decision to attend their current college. However, another measure of the impact of the Tuition Grant, as perceived by the respondents, is exemplified by the findings that of 233 students who were receiving financial aid, 90% felt that their aid would not be adequate without the grant.

APPENDIX A

TABLE A-1

Relationship of Choice as Influential Factor to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF LOCATION AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	28	20	13	61
	Row Pct	45.9	32.8	21.3	17.4
	Col Pct	16.9	14.6	27.7	
	Tot Pct	8.0	5.7	3.7	
$I0,000-$I9,999		51	51	20	122
		41.8	41.8	16.4	34.9
		30.7	37.2	42.6	
		14.6	14.6	5.7	
$20,000 and up		87	66	14	167
		52.1	39.5	8.4	47.7
		52.4	48.2	29.8	
		24.9	18.9	4.0	
	Column Total	166	137	47	350
		47.4	39.1	13.4	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 9.25428 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0550

TABLE A-2

Relationship of Cost as an Influencing Factor to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF COST AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	8	16	37	61
	Row Pct	13.1	26.2	60.7	18.3
	Col Pct	22.9	13.4	20.6	
	Tot Pct	2.4	4.8	11.1	
$10,000-$19,999		9	42	62	113
		8.0	37.2	54.9	33.8
		25.7	35.3	34.4	
		2.7	12.6	18.6	
$20,000 and up		18	61	81	160
		11.2	38.1	50.6	47.9
		51.4	51.3	45.0	
		5.4	18.3	24.3	
	Column Total	35	119	180	334
		10.5	35.6	53.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 3.89912 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .4198

TABLE A-3

Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from College to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM COLLEGE		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	2	30	32
	Row Pct	6.3	93.8	80.0
	Col Pct	100.0	78.9	
	Tot Pct	5.0	75.0	
$6,000-$9,999		0	3	3
		0	100.0	7.5
		0	7.9	
		0	7.5	
$10,000 and up		0	5	5
		0	100.0	12.5
		0	13.2	
		0	12.5	
	Column Total	2	38	40
		5.0	95.0	100.0

Raw Chi Square = .52632 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .7686

TABLE A-4

Relationship of Enrollment in College without TAGLP to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		COLLEGE ENROLLMENT WITHOUT TAGLP			
		Yes	No	Maybe	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	11	10	18	39
	Row Pct	28.2	25.6	46.2	79.6
	Col Pct	68.8	71.4	94.7	
	Tot Pct	22.4	20.4	36.7	
$6,000-$9,999		3	1	0	4
		75.0	25.0	0	8.2
		18.8	7.1	0	
		6.1	2.0	0	
$10,000 and up		2	3	1	6
		33.3	50.0	16.7	12.2
		12.5	21.4	5.3	
		4.1	6.1	2.0	
	Column Total	16	14	19	49
		32.7	28.6	38.8	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 6.38818 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .1720

TABLE A-5

Relationship of the Respondents' Descriptions of Proposed Activity without TAGLP to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		RESPONDENTS' DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY WITHOUT TAGLP					
		Attend Private Va. College	Attend Out-of State College	Attend Public Va. College	Not Attend College	Other	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	3	2	9	8	4	26
	Row Pct	11.5	7.7	34.6	30.8	15.4	83.9
	Col Pct	75.0	50.0	90.0	88.9	100.0	
	Tot Pct	9.7	6.5	29.0	25.8	12.9	
$6,000-$9,999		0	1	0	0	0	1
		0	100.0	0	0	0	3.2
		0	25.0	0	0	0	
		0	3.2	0	0	0	
$10,000 and up		1	1	1	1	0	4
		25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0	12.9
		25.0	25.0	10.0	11.1	0	
		3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	0	
Column Total		4	4	10	9	4	31
		12.9	12.9	32.3	29.0	12.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 9.04167 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .3388

TABLE A-6

Relationship of Extra Money from Family to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM FAMILY		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	11	39	50
	Row Pct	22.0	78.0	32.3
	Col Pct	19.6	39.4	
	Tot Pct	7.1	25.2	
$10,000-$19,999		25	43	68
		36.8	63.2	43.9
		44.6	43.4	
		16.1	27.7	
$20,000 and up		20	17	37
		54.1	45.9	23.9
		35.7	17.2	
		12.9	11.0	
	Column Total	56	99	155
		36.1	63.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 9.48922 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0087

TABLE A-7

Relationship of Extra Money from College
to Family Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM COLLEGE		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$0000-$9,999	Count	4	46	50
	Row Pct	8.0	92.0	32.3
	Col Pct	50.0	31.3	
	Tot Pct	2.6	29.7	
$10,000-$19,999		3	65	68
		4.4	95.6	43.9
		37.5	44.2	
		1.9	41.9	
$20,000 and up		1	36	37
		2.7	97.3	23.9
		12.5	24.5	
		.6	23.2	
	Column Total	8	147	155
		5.2	94.8	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 1.35808 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .5071

TABLE A-8

Relationship of Location as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF LOCATION AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	16	11	8	35
	Row Pct	45.7	31.4	22.9	79.5
	Col Pct	76.2	84.6	80.0	
	Tot Pct	36.4	25.0	18.2	
$6,000-$9,999		2	0	1	3
		66.7	0	33.3	6.8
		9.5	0	10.0	
		4.5	0	2.3	
$10,000 and up		3	2	1	6
		50.0	33.3	16.7	13.6
		14.3	15.4	10.0	
		6.8	4.5	2.3	
	Column Total	21	13	10	44
		47.7	29.5	22.7	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 1.46490 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .8328

TABLE A-9

Relationship of Academic Quality as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF ACADEMIC QUALITY AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	21	10	3	34
	Row Pct	61.8	29.4	8.8	79.1
	Col Pct	87.5	71.4	60.0	
	Tot Pct	48.8	23.3	7.0	
$6,000-$9,999		0	2	1	3
		0	66.7	33.3	7.0
		0	14.3	20.0	
		0	4.7	2.3	
$10,000 and up		3	2	1	6
		50.0	33.3	16.7	14.0
		12.5	14.3	20.0	
		7.0	4.7	2.3	
	Column Total	24	14	5	43
		55.8	32.6	11.6	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 4.67941 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .3218

TABLE A-10

Relationship of Cost as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF COST AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	6	8	19	33
	Row Pct	18.2	24.2	57.6	80.5
	Col Pct	85.7	100.0	73.1	
	Tot Pct	14.6	19.5	46.3	
$6,000-$9,999		1	0	2	3
		33.3	0	66.7	7.3
		14.3	0	7.7	
		2.4	0	4.9	
$10,000 and up		0	0	5	5
		0	0	100.0	12.2
		0	0	19.2	
		0	0	12.2	
	Column Total	7	8	26	41
		17.1	19.5	63.4	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 4.51915 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .3403

TABLE A-11

Relationship of Financial Assistance as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	7	13	15	35
	Row Pct	20.0	37.1	42.9	79.5
	Col Pct	77.8	76.5	83.3	
	Tot Pct	15.9	29.5	34.1	
$6,000-$9,999		0	1	2	3
		0	33.3	66.7	6.8
		0	5.9	11.1	
		0	2.3	4.5	
$10,000 and up		2	3	1	6
		33.3	50.0	16.7	13.6
		22.2	17.6	5.6	
		4.5	6.8	2.3	
	Column Total	9	17	18	44
		20.5	38.6	40.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 2.72723 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .6045

TABLE A-12

Relationship of Academic Program as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF SPECIALIZED ACADEMIC PROGRAM AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	12	10	10	32
	Row Pct	37.5	31.3	31.3	78.0
	Col Pct	70.6	83.3	83.3	
	Tot Pct	29.3	24.4	24.4	
$6,000-$9,999		2	1	0	3
		66.7	33.3	0	7.3
		11.8	8.3	0	
		4.9	2.4	0	
$10,000 and up		3	1	2	6
		50.0	16.7	33.3	14.6
		17.6	8.3	16.7	
		7.3	2.4	4.9	
	Column Total	17	12	12	41
		41.5	29.3	29.3	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 2.02655 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .7309

TABLE A-13

Relationship of Tuition Assistance as an Influence on Choice to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		PRIORITY OF TUITION ASSISTANCE AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	3	11	20	34
	Row Pct	8.8	32.4	58.8	79.1
	Col Pct	100.0	68.8	83.3	
	Tot Pct	7.0	25.6	46.5	
$6,000-$9,999		0	1	2	3
		0	33.3	66.7	7.0
		0	6.3	8.3	
		0	2.3	4.7	
$10,000 and up		0	4	2	6
		0	66.7	33.3	14.0
		0	25.0	8.3	
		0	9.3	4.7	
	Column Total	3	16	24	43
		7.0	37.2	55.8	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 3.08272 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .5441

TABLE A-14

Relationship of Aid Sufficiency without TAGLP to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		AID SUFFICIENCY WITHOUT TAGLP		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	2	32	34
	Row Pct	5.9	94.1	81.0
	Col Pct	100.0	80.0	
	Tot Pct	4.8	76.2	
$6,000-$9,999		0	3	3
		0	100.0	7.1
		0	7.5	
		0	7.1	
$10,000 and up		0	5	5
		0	100.0	11.9
		0	12.5	
		0	11.9	
	Column Total	2	40	42
		4.8	95.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = .49412 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .7811

TABLE A-15

Relationship of Extra Money from Family
to Respondents' Income Levels

INCOME LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM FAMILY		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$0000-$5,999	Count	2	30	32
	Row Pct	6.3	93.8	80.0
	Col Pct	50.0	83.3	
	Tot Pct	5.0	75.0	
$6,000-$9,999		1	2	3
		33.3	66.7	7.5
		25.0	5.6	
		2.5	5.0	
$10,000 and up		1	4	5
		20.0	80.0	12.5
		25.0	11.1	
		2.5	10.0	
	Column Total	4	36	40
		10.0	90.0	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 2.87037 with 2 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .2381

TABLE A-16

Relationship of Cost as an Influence on
Choice to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		PRIORITY OF COST AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	11	25	30	66
	Row Pct	16.7	37.9	45.5	15.8
	Col Pct	22.9	17.6	13.2	
	Tot Pct	2.6	6.0	7.2	
$1,980-$2,170		18	35	52	105
		17.1	33.3	49.5	25.2
		37.5	24.6	22.9	
		4.3	8.4	12.5	
$2,400-$2,675		7	36	54	97
		7.2	37.1	55.7	23.3
		14.6	25.4	23.8	
		1.7	8.6	12.9	
$2,820-$2,940		9	30	61	100
		9.0	30.0	61.0	24.0
		18.8	21.1	26.9	
		2.2	7.2	14.6	
$3,140-$3,905		3	16	30	49
		6.1	32.7	61.2	11.8
		6.3	11.3	13.2	
		.7	3.8	7.2	
	Column Total	48	142	227	417
		11.5	34.1	54.4	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 11.50923 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .1745

TABLE A-17

Relationship of Specialized Academic Programs as an Influence on Choice to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		PRIORITY OF SPECIALIZED ACADEMIC PROGRAM AS FACTOR			
		1,2	3,4	5,6,7	Row Total
$1,170- $1,880	Count	24	22	19	65
	Row Pct	36.9	33.8	29.2	15.6
	Col Pct	17.1	13.8	16.0	
	Tot Pct	5.7	5.3	4.5	
$1,980- $2,170		37	29	39	105
		35.2	27.6	37.1	25.1
		26.4	18.2	32.8	
		8.9	6.9	9.3	
$2,400- $2,675		34	36	29	99
		34.3	36.4	29.3	23.7
		24.3	22.6	24.4	
		8.1	8.6	6.9	
$2,820- $2,940		30	46	23	99
		30.3	46.5	23.2	23.7
		21.4	28.9	19.3	
		7.2	11.0	5.5	
$3,140- $3,905		15	26	9	50
		30.0	52.0	18.0	12.0
		10.7	16.4	7.6	
		3.6	6.2	2.2	
	Column Total	140	159	119	418
		33.5	38.0	28.5	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 14.29859 with 8 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .0743

TABLE A-18

Relationship of Aid Sufficiency
to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		AID SUFFICIENCY		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	33	25	58
	Row Pct	56.9	43.1	24.9
	Col Pct	24.1	26.0	
	Tot Pct	14.2	10.7	
$1,980-$2,170		31	28	59
		52.5	47.5	25.3
		22.6	29.2	
		13.3	12.0	
$2,400-$2,675		34	19	53
		64.2	35.8	22.7
		24.8	19.8	
		14.6	8.2	
$2,820-$2,940		29	15	44
		65.9	34.1	18.9
		21.2	15.6	
		12.4	6.4	
$3,140-$3,905		10	9	19
		52.6	47.4	8.2
		7.3	9.4	
		4.3	3.9	
	Column Total	137	96	233
		58.8	41.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 2.88313 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .5776

TABLE A-19

Relationship of Aid Sufficiency without TAGLP to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		AID SUFFICIENCY WITHOUT TAGLP		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	6	52	58
	Row Pct	10.3	89.7	24.9
	Col Pct	25.0	24.9	
	Tot Pct	2.6	22.3	
$1,980-$2,170		4	55	59
		6.8	93.2	25.3
		16.7	26.3	
		1.7	23.6	
$2,400-$2,675		3	50	53
		5.7	94.3	22.7
		12.5	23.9	
		1.3	21.5	
$2,820-$2,940		9	35	44
		20.5	79.5	18.9
		37.5	16.7	
		3.9	15.0	
$3,140-$3,905		2	17	19
		10.5	89.5	8.2
		8.3	8.1	
		.9	7.3	
	Column Total	24	209	233
		10.3	89.7	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 6.93786 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .1392

TABLE A-20

Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from Family to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM FAMILY		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	15	36	51
	Row Pct	29.4	70.6	24.5
	Col Pct	23.4	25.0	
	Tot Pct	7.2	17.3	
$1,980-$2,170		13	43	56
		23.2	76.8	26.9
		20.3	29.9	
		6.3	20.7	
$2,400-$2,675		18	31	49
		36.7	63.3	23.6
		28.1	21.5	
		8.7	14.9	
$2,820-$2,940		12	23	35
		34.3	65.7	16.8
		18.8	16.0	
		5.8	11.1	
$3,140-$3,905		6	11	17
		35.3	64.7	8.2
		9.4	7.6	
		2.9	5.3	
	Column Total	64	144	208
		30.8	69.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 2.72978 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .6040

TABLE A-21

Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from College to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM COLLEGE		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	0	51	51
	Row Pct	0	100.0	24.5
	Col Pct	0	25.8	
	Tot Pct	0	24.5	
$1,980-$2,170		5	51	56
		8.9	91.1	26.9
		50.0	25.8	
		2.4	24.5	
$2,400-$2,675		2	47	49
		4.1	95.9	23.6
		20.0	23.7	
		1.0	22.6	
$2,820-$2,940		1	34	35
		2.9	97.1	16.8
		10.0	17.2	
		.5	16.3	
$3,140-$3,905		2	15	17
		11.8	88.2	8.2
		20.0	7.6	
		1.0	7.2	
	Column Total	10	198	208
		4.8	95.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 6.79095 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .1469

TABLE A-22

Relationship of Receiving Extra Money from Other Sources to College Tuition Levels

TUITION LEVELS		EXTRA MONEY FROM OTHER SOURCES		
		Yes	No	Row Total
$1,170-$1,880	Count	11	40	51
	Row Pct	21.6	78.4	24.5
	Col Pct	28.9	23.5	
	Tot Pct	5.3	19.2	
$1,980-$2,170		11	45	56
		19.6	80.4	26.9
		28.9	26.5	
		5.3	21.6	
$2,400-$2,675		10	39	49
		20.4	79.6	23.6
		26.3	22.9	
		4.8	18.8	
$2,820-$2,940		5	30	35
		14.3	85.7	16.8
		13.2	17.6	
		2.4	14.4	
$3,140-$3,905		1	16	17
		5.9	94.1	8.2
		2.6	9.4	
		.5	7.7	
	Column Total	38	170	208
		18.3	81.7	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 2.71158 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .6072

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF TUITION ASSISTANCE GRANT AND LOAN PROGRAM, 1977-78

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the questions below by either checking the appropriate box or filling in the information requested. If you do not know the answer to a question or do not wish to respond to a question, leave the answer space blank.

1. What college do you presently attend?

   _____

2. What is your present year in college?

   ☐1st ☐2nd ☐3rd ☐4th

3. Have you transferred from another college or university? ☐Yes ☐No

   Name of college _____

4. Sex: ☐F ☐M

5. Married: ☐Yes ☐No

6. Age: _____

7. Race: _____

8. Number of brothers and/or sisters _____

9. Number of brothers and/or sisters at

   secondary school level (grades 9-12) ____

   college or university level _____

10. Residence:

    A. ☐ Live at parents' home
    B. ☐ Live in college dormitory/housing
    C. ☐ Live in rented facility close to college
    D. ☐ Other (Please specify):

    _____

11. How would you classify yourself in terms of economic status?

    A. ☐ Dependent upon my parents for primary financial support
    B. ☐ Independent of my parents for primary financial support
    C. If you checked item A, what is your best estimate of your parents' income from all sources for the past year?
       ☐ Less than $5,000
       ☐ $5,000 to 9,999
       ☐ $10,000 to 14,999
       ☐ $15,000 to 19,999
       ☐ $20,000 to 24,999
       ☐ $25,000 or more
    D. If you checked item B, what is your best estimate of your income for the past year? (If married, include spouse's income.)
       ☐ $0000 to 3,999
       ☐ $4,000 to 5,999
       ☐ $6,000 to 7,999
       ☐ $8,000 to 9,999
       ☐ $10,000 to 11,999
       ☐ Above $12,000

12. Is the college you are presently attending your "first choice" college? ☐ Yes ☐ No

13. If Yes, skip Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16 and go on to No. 17.

    If No, what was the name of your "first choice" college?

    _____

14. In what state was your "first choice" college located?

    _____

15. My "first choice" college was
    ☐ public ☐ private

16. Why did you not attend your "first choice" institution?

    A. ☐ Refused admission
    B. ☐ Too expensive
    C. ☐ Other (please specify):

    _____

17. Please rank the following considerations in order of priority in terms of their influence on your decision to attend the college at which you are presently enrolled. You should assign 1 to the most influential consideration, 2 to the second most influential, etc., through number 7, the least influential.

    A. ____ Location of the college
    B. ____ Academic quality of the college
    C. ____ Cost to attend the college
    D. ____ Amount of financial assistance provided by the college
    E. ____ Specialized academic program offered
    F. ____ Expectation of receiving a Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant
    G. ____ Other (Please specify):

    _____

NOTE: THE FINANCIAL INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW WILL NOT INFLUENCE THE AMOUNT OF STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE WHICH YOU RECEIVE NOW OR MIGHT RECEIVE IN THE FUTURE. THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR LONG RANGE STATE WIDE ANALYSIS AND WILL NOT HAVE ANY IMPAST ON YOU AS AN INDIVIDUAL.

18. Estimate the educational costs and the source(s) and amount of funds to pay these costs for your current academic year (1977-78):

Educational Costs Estimate

A.	Tuition and Fees	$_____
B.	Room and Board	$_____
C.	Books and Supplies	$_____
D.	Transportation	$_____
E.	Other Expenses	$_____
	TOTAL	$_____

Resource(s) Estimate

F.	Parents	$_____
G.	Spouse	$_____
H.	Student Savings	$_____
J.	Student Financial Assistance (scholarships, loans, all sources except K)	$_____
K.	Va. Tuition Asst. Grant	$_____
L.	Other	$_____
	TOTAL	$_____

If you are receiving student financial assistance (Item J, Question 18) other than the expected Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant, please answer Questions 19 through 22. Those receiving no assistance as identified in Item J, Question 18, please proceed to Questions 21 and 22.

19. In your opinion, is the financial aid you expect to receive this year from all sources sufficient for your college education expenses for the year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

20. Would your expected total aid package from all sources be sufficient without the state's Tuition Assistance Grant? ☐ Yes ☐ No

    If no, where would this needed money come from? Please check the appropriate space(s):
    ☐ Family ☐ College ☐ Other
    ☐ Don't Know

21. Would you have enrolled at the college you are attending if the Tuition Assistance Grant were not available? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Maybe

22. If you answered no or maybe to question 21, which of the following statements best describes what you would have done?

    A. ☐ Attended my current institution on a part-time basis
    B. ☐ Attended another in-state private college
    C. ☐ Attended a private college out-of-state
    D. ☐ Attended a public college in Virginia
    E. ☐ Attended a public college in another state
    F. ☐ Not attended college this year
    G. ☐ Other (specify):

    _____

23. Please utilize this space to make any comments you care to regarding the Tuition Assistance Grant Program:

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
No postage stamp necessary if mailed in the United States

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY

CENTER FOR THE STUDY
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, RUFFNER HALL
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, 405 EMMET STREET
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903

First Class
Permit No. 666
Charlottesville, Va.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Applicants

FROM: Dr. Gordon Davies, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, and Mr. Don Holden, Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia

As you know, the Commonwealth of Virginia has for several years been providing assistance to students attending private institutions in the state through the Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program. This Fall we are undertaking a study of the program and the students who are participating in it. Only through such a study can we gain the information necessary to assess the effectiveness of the program and continue to make program changes which will make it more responsive to student needs.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to provide information to us for the study. Your honest and prompt completion of the questionnaire items is most important to us. Time and expense will not permit us to contact all program participants; therefore, you are one of a sample of students requested to respond. No attempt is made on the questionnaire to identify you personally.

Upon completion of the questionnaire please mail it to the address shown. Staff members of the Center for the Study of Higher Education and the Bureau of Educational Research at the Universtiy of Virginia are conducting the study for the two Councils.

Thank you for your assistance and best wishes for a successful year.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

September 12, 1977

M E M O R A N D U M

TO:

FROM: Jay L. Chronister, Project Director
Study of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Recipients

In keeping with the directions provided by the President of your college, I am enclosing a packet of envelopes containing questionnaires which are to be distributed to the students whose names are on the envelopes. The students whose names are on the envelopes are part of a sample of students we are contacting in the study of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Recipients for the 1977-78 academic year.

Since the names of students chosen were drawn from a roster of Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan applicants on file with the State Council of Higher Education as of August 1, the envelopes may contain the names of some students who:

1. Did not enroll for the Fall semester or quarter, or
2. Are Virginia Tuition Assistance Loan Applicants (3rd and 4th year students) whom we are not including in the study.

If you receive envelopes for individuals who meet either of the above conditions, please return those envelopes to us. We would appreciate your distribution of the envelopes to the students as quickly as possible and your encouragement of the prompt return of the questionnaire.

Non-delivered envelopes should be returned to me at: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Ruffner Hall, University of Virginia, 405 Emmet Street, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Thank you for your assistance at a busy time of year. If you have questions regarding this request, please call me at (804) 924-3333.

JLC:bz

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

September 12, 1977

MEMORANDUM

TO:

FROM: Jay L. Chronister, Project Director
Study of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Recipients

Enclosed with this memorandum is a list of some of the students from your institution who have been identified as Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan Program applicants for the 1977-78 academic year. These individuals are part of the startified random sample of students we are attempting to contact in the conduct of the study.

In keeping with the directions provided by your President, we are submitting the list to you so that you will provide us with the students' complete campus or local addresses in order that we can mail the study questionnaire directly to them. Since the sample of students was drawn from a roster of Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan applicants on file with the State Council of Higher Education as of August 1, the list may contain the names of some students who:

1. Did not enroll for the Fall semester or quarter, or
2. Are Virginia Tuition Assistance Loan Applicants (3rd and 4th year students) whom we are not including in the study.

If students included on the list have not registered, please draw a line through the name. If the student is a third or fourth year student and therefore not eligible for a grant but eligible for a Virginia Tuition Assistance Loan, place an (L) in front of the name and do not provide an address.

In order to meet the deadlines for reporting the study results to the State Council of Higher Education, and the Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia it is imperative that we receive the student addresses no later than Monday, September 19.

Please return the list with the student addresses to me at the following address: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Ruffner Hall, University of Virginia, 405 Emmet Street, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903.

Thank you for your assistance at a busy time of year. If you have questions regarding this request, please call me at (804) 924-3333.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

September 27, 1977

M E M O R A N D U M

TO:

FROM: Jay L. Chronister, Project Director
Study of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Recipients

Several weeks ago, you were asked to help us distribute surveys to a randomly selected group of students from your institution who are receiving TAGLP grants for this school year. We are asking again for your assistance in distributing surveys to the TAGLP grant recipients whose names are attached.

Unfortunately, some of the surveys have been returned to us by students who are not receiving the grant; other students, named on the previous list, are not in attendance at your institution. Therefore, we need to replace an equal number of respondents for those who were either uneligible for a TAGLP grant or not attending your college.

Please distribute these surveys only to first and second year students currently receiving a TAGLP grant. If any of these students are not enrolled this semester or are third or fourth year students please return the questionnaires to me.

We are sorry to cause you this inconvenience but lack of adequate information on the original lists of students from the State Council records has caused us problems. We will not be submitting any additional lists to you for action. Thank you for your continued cooperation.

JLC:bkz

405 EMMET STREET RUFFNER HALL UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
CURRY MEMORIAL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

September 27, 1977

M E M O R A N D U M

TO:

FROM: Jay L. Chronister, Project Director
Study of Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Recipients

Several weeks ago you supplied us with addresses for students who had been identified by the State Council of Higher Education as Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant and Loan applicants for the 1977-78 academic year. Since a significant number of the students on the original list either did not register for the Fall Semester, or were third and fourth year students who are not being included in the study because they are Tuition Loan recipients it is necessary that we ask you to provide us with addresses for students on the enclosed list.

Once again we request that you draw a line through the name of any student who did not register for the Fall Semester. If the student is a third or fourth year student and therefore not eligible for a grant but eligible for a Virginia Tuition Assistance Loan, place an (L) in front of the name and do not provide an address. Please return the list as soon as possible.

We are sorry to cause you this inconvenience but lack of adequate information on the original lists of students from the State Council records has caused us problems. We will not be submitting any additional lists to you for action. Thank you for your continued cooperation.

JLC:bkz

405 EMMET STREET RUFFNER HALL UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903